

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

COPY 1 OF 3 COPIES

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

21st Meeting

Thursday, 11 February 1954

11:00 a.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

RECEIVED  
11 FEB 1954  
02011

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD

21st Meeting

Thursday, 11 February 1954

11:00 a.m.

DCI Conference Room

Administration Building

Present

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick  
Inspector General, Chairman

Matthew Baird  
Director of Training, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
DC/PP, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Chief of Operations, Alt. for DD/P, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
DAD/O, Member

[REDACTED]  
AD/Communications, Member

25X1A9a

Harrison G. Reynolds  
AD/Personnel, Member

Huntington Sheldon  
AD/I, Alt. for DD/I, Member

Lawrence K. White  
Acting DD/A, Member

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Executive Secretary

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Secretariat

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]  
Reporter

~~SECRET~~

. . . The 21st Meeting of the CIA Career Service Board convened at 11:00 a.m., 11 February 1954, in the DCI Conference Room, Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick presiding . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, gentlemen, shall we come to order?

The first item on the agenda is the minutes of the 4 February Meeting. Are there any amendments or changes desired in these minutes?

MR. BAIRD: Item one, paragraphs 1 and 2, everybody seems to think is a good idea, but what do we do about it? I don't see, again, any action that means anything. Is anything going to be done? If so, who is going to do it and how?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: As I recall the discussion, we came to the conclusion that in this particular case the individual will be on the T/O of SR Division but will be utilized by the other Division Offices in the Agency as the need arises. I think other cases ought to be handled on an identical basis.

MR. BAIRD: All on an individual basis?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How else are you going to do it? I don't think we have enough of them to set up a pattern. Do you know of a large number?

MR. REYNOLDS: Very few of them. I checked them the other day after we discussed [REDACTED] and there doesn't seem to be more than two or three, that I can find.

MR. BAIRD: I would think there might be one or two in almost every Office.

MR. REYNOLDS: I haven't gone into it to the point of checking down through the Offices yet.

MR. WHITE: When I read this the question that hit me square in the face was: What does this have to do with Career Service? These people are not career people. This is purely a personnel problem of trying to get a man on board and make him available to all Offices.

MR. BAIRD: These are people that are on board.

MR. WHITE: We're not doing this to develop their careers.

MR. BAIRD: You're certainly not going to lose sight of the man's career, if you're going to keep him at all - the point being that the Agency doesn't want to lose him. ORR, for instance, has a girl that is a brilliant

SECRET

Russian teacher but they can't get her a clearance to go upstairs and, therefore, they can't utilize her full-time. She probably has value to [REDACTED] Office of Training, ORR, and perhaps someplace else, but we're probably going to lose her. FOIAb3b1

MR. WHITE: But if she does have those limitations she would probably never qualify for the Career Service as we are thinking about it. I'm really not trying to debate it, at all.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I am inclined to agree with you, Red, that it is a case of personnel administration, because this particular individual I don't see as a careerist. As I indicated, there are going to be demands on him from other parts of the Government, which we will have to yield to. But I think where you have an individual who is so highly specialized that he is partly useful to OSI, and partly useful to TSS, and partly useful to Training, that something can be negotiated out, with one Office taking him and then loaning him to the other Offices.

MR. REYNOLDS: Sort of a roving category of slot.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But I don't think it is a large enough category to worry about too much. Quite frankly, Matt, this is the first case of its kind that I have run into.

Do you have any specific annotation to the minutes?

MR. BAIRD: No, I wouldn't if that is what happened. But I don't see the point of bringing something up and discussing it--to me it was left out. I don't think the solution means anything, to tell you the truth. In other words, we have raised the question. It has been brought up to you and has been brought up again in individual cases, and it seems to me we have left it hanging without arriving at a solution. Those of us who read the exit interviews know that people are leaving the Agency who I don't think should be allowed to go. At least some consideration ought to be given to the use of certain slots to be administered whenever the need arises, the same as Career Development Slots, for people of multiple use.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But I think, Matt, the CIA Career Service Board can best utilize its time in trying to work out the framework of the Career Service Program, and leave to the individual supervisors and individual Career Boards the effective personnel management which is, to my mind, where this case lies. I'll be perfectly honest to admit that I don't think we can lick

SECRET

these problems as a Board. I think it is only by the collective effort of everybody in the Agency that we are going to cut down the number of separations of people that we don't want to lose, and not by trying to thrash out individual cases here.

MR. BAIRD: That is exactly what I didn't want to do, put in a category of individual cases. It seems to me we could establish a policy. This policy leaves much to be desired; in fact, it really isn't a policy at all, it's treating it as an individual case rather than a group. Let me do a little thinking on my own and see if I can come up with something.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, if you can find [REDACTED] which is one-25X9A2 tenth of one per cent of the Agency personnel, I would be surprised.

MR. REYNOLDS: I see no reason why a category "at large" or slots "at large" can't be used and then they can go wherever useful--carried as a special case.

MR. BAIRD: That is exactly the point I am making. Maybe I have more than anybody else because we are offered people by the DD/P, for whom they have no use, that are damn good people, but they say, "We have a ceiling bind and we can't use this man but about half the time." So, they say, "Can Training use them?" I say, "Sure, but we can only use them about half the time." So, if both of us say "No", the man is going to leave the Agency because there's no job that utilizes him full-time in one Office.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Matt, why don't you and Harry get together on this problem?

MR. REYNOLDS: First we will try to find out how many bodies we are dealing with here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are there any other suggested changes in the minutes? I believe that these minutes will reflect this discussion so there will be no need to change the minutes of the 4 February Meeting.

MR. BAIRD: I don't want to change them, I just wanted to call it to your attention.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If there are no changes we will consider the minutes approved as submitted.

Now, gentlemen, shall we continue our discussion on the memorandum 25X1A9a which I sent to the Director? [REDACTED] would you care to resume the floor?

SECRET

SECRET

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think we ought to give somebody else a crack at it.

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: [REDACTED] what are your reactions?  
25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I have them all annotated here. We've gone over the paragraphs down to "g". In "g", I don't think that your conclusion is necessarily so. (Reading)

The fact that there are still many of these slots open is indicative of a lack of interest in career development or encouragement of rotation among the offices.

As far as I am concerned, if we have one man on a rotation slot getting his Master's degree at Cornell University we have another man lined up to take his place on that same slot when he comes back. So far as I am concerned it isn't a lack of interest, it's a lack of ability to make maximum use of rotation slots when practically all of my people are highly specialized.

On the next paragraph, "i", I had no comment. On the lack of interest in going to Harvard being indicative of a lack of interest in Career Development, I said, "Not necessarily so." You may be quite interested in career development but still not want your boys to go to Harvard. (Laughter)

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I resent that, General.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You're sitting next to two of them.

MR. BAIRD: Hear! Hear!

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Nothing meant toward Harvard.

MR. BAIRD: I think you lump Harvard with the military schools.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] On "j", at the bottom of the page: (Reading)

There is no indication that creation of "career service boards" has improved these actions any.

I dissent so far as the Office of Communications is concerned.

As to paragraph "k", I've talked to my people who are normally administrative people and they just don't want to leave the home nest. They know the Career Service Board is looking after them pretty well. I said, "Well, listen, you are probably missing some opportunities for higher grades than you have now, and if you were with the Assistant Director of Personnel's Board you would probably come up, in order of seniority, for assignment in an administrative job in another part of the Agency." With the exception of two people in my administrative staff, all of the others have had some communications' training and consider themselves eligible for rotation to do a communications' job. They're all pushing to go overseas in a communications'

SECRET

job. The other two are perhaps afraid to be thrown out into the world where they would have to compete with others,--I don't know. But I concur in the principle that administrative people should be detailed just like the Quarter-master people are detailed in the Services.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: May I make a cross-comment on that while you're on that point? It seems to me that if we are going to have a Career Service Program that is across the Agency, this is a fairly fundamental part of it. But it also seems to me that the accomplishment of this is a very long-term objective which will come about primarily through education and through actual proof of the pudding rather than by trying to force it, to any degree. The DD/I Offices stand almost solidly united in opposition to this, and I think their opposition stems largely from a misconception of what the DD/A proposes, rather than from any true, fundamental policy objection to the philosophy.

Now I think the average person down along the line in administrative jobs, is, as you say, happy in his own nest. He doesn't know too well the people in Personnel or in Logistics, or in Finance, unless he actually came from there originally, and consequently he doesn't want to put his fate in the hands of individuals that he doesn't know. But I do think that as we develop a program and DD/A is able to rotate into jobs on request of the individual offices' administrators, that this will take care of itself on a very long-term basis. I think if we approach it in any other way we're going to get into what I referred to here as the "shotgun approach", which I think is NOT the way to do it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED]: Also, Kirk, isn't that the whole basis of designation, the ability of the individual to pick out his own?

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Certainly.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Then you can't force him into them.

[REDACTED] I have what they call the "Fiscal Support Branch", and they handle travel vouchers and pick and shovel work on the budget. Their potential does not lie in the Office of Communications unless they are willing to go back and go to school and learn to be radio operators. If they were considered in the Finance pool then when a vacancy comes up and say here's a man who is a 7 and there's a 9 vacancy, then I think he should be given consideration for that vacancy, and I'll be willing to accept a detail of a man who can do that type of work, and he doesn't have to know anything about

SECRET

communications. I think they're shortsighted, and I'm going to try to talk the three people of that Section into changing that designation. With a lot of these people it's just the old school tie they like, and they like their offices and want to stay with them. They just don't want to go someplace else. I have two people in my registry who got in there because they had been radio operators in the Service but they don't want anything to do with communications. One is a graduate of George Washington in Foreign Affairs. I'm trying to find where he can fit. He is interested in the NEA area.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are we not in general agreement, as a Board, that this is a gradual approach and to be done on an educational basis?

MR. BAIRD: I think it will work out that way.

MR. WHITE: I certainly concur with that. Just as a matter of interest I might say that in applying this in the DD/P area recently, when we come up to fill a vacancy--especially in the grade 14 or 15 categories--we have been asking all of the administrative offices to make nominations, even though the man might be Finance, Logistics or Security, and everybody submitted nominations, so that we had a pretty broad field to pick from. In addition, which I think would meet your problem (indicating Mr. Sheldon), in the last case we considered--actually, I think we had a slate of 7 or 8 names to consider--the Board chose the nomination of the Division. The man had a PP career designation, I believe, and the Board selected him to fill that position and changed his career designation in the same action. I thoroughly agree that it is a gradual thing, but that is the way it is working now. It isn't a question of pushing a lot of people on.

25X1A9a

Paragraph 3a. - there are too many Career Service Boards. I don't know, because I don't know what the others are doing. (Reading)

The number of boards creates a waste in executive manpower for the participants and in clerical time for support.

I don't consider that applicable to my Board, and I don't know anything about the other Boards.

Paragraph 3b. - I don't believe promotions by intra-agency boards is workable. I think that such a board would find great difficulty in comparing a man who is eligible and qualified for promotion from an 11 to a 12, and a 12 to a 13,--a communications man who has been a Deputy Area Chief, with an 11 or 12 in PP, for example, or in any other part of the Agency. I don't



SECRET

25X1A9a

know how the Board could do it unless we were going to go by seniority like the Army used to do, which is purely arbitrary.

MR. [REDACTED] If Personnel starts looking to a board for promotion, instead of their AD's, it's going to raise cane. You can't operate by boards.

MR. BAIRD: Except the super-Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, there are actually two ways you can do it. You can either cut off your office boards at a certain level and then put them into intra-Agency boards by grades, or you can put them into an intra-Agency board when individuals become, say, general CIA potential executives rather than specialists. For example, you would have people in FI where you wouldn't have to do much analysis to realize that they were FI-types for the rest of their lives, they didn't have the potential for other fields, they were operators, they wanted to stay in that field, and they wouldn't be the types you would be considering across the Agency to move into another office or the general executive category. The same thing applies to communicators or training officers who want to make training a career on a long-term basis and who want to rotate into another office for experience, but they aren't getting that experience to advance into the executive level, they are getting that experience to make them better educators in training. But when we get up to the executive inventory category where you have competition between individuals for future executive jobs of the Agency, then you do get into a state where you have to equalize and see that your promotions are balanced across the board.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But aren't your available vacancies balanced in your T/O structure? If I have a vacancy in for a Field Chief and he has moved out and there is a 14 there, do we have to go before a board to justify him for that 15? That wouldn't make any sense to me at all.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Your proposal would affect me so little that I really have no comment on it. That board would really be a board that was selecting for general executives. It seems to have some merit, but it wouldn't deny the specialist his consideration for promotion in his own field, - is that what your proposal was?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is certainly a modification of it.

MR. BAIRD: That is really quite a serious modification.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Actually, some of these things are deliberately extreme.

SECRET

MR. BAIRD: They are provocative.

If you have a promotion board that sits on the promotion of all those who are identified on the executive inventory that is one thing, but I didn't read that into this.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I'm not sure that is a solution if we have a 14 on the executive inventory and we want to promote him into a 15 position.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The point is, if you want to promote him to a 15 and next year you want to nominate him for another job in the Agency, then you have outpriced your man.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] This seems to me like the selection of general officer grade. That is what you are talking about.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] That would be the super-grade board. 25X1A9a

[REDACTED] No, just below that.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Moving people into potential position for super-grades.

[REDACTED] I think the best man ought to be picked for the 25X1A9a job if he is what we used to call a "line" officer.

MR. REYNOLDS: Of course, I think the whole picture that Joe brings up is so unique that it can't be classed as part of the whole Agency thing. There is nothing that wrecks morale faster in those field offices of OO than not to have promotions within the field offices. They are a little, integrated team that has to work closely together. They are all extroverts. You haven't got technicians or top administrators, you've got salesmen.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Well, everybody else has comparable problems.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: One of the reasons for putting this proposal in is to smoke out whether it is the general opinion that we have a CIA Career Service system or individual systems.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But it must be built on individual systems.

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Which lends logic to this proposal, then.

MR. [REDACTED] I think this is one that you ought to take up with the individual offices.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It is a mere rubber-stamping process. A GS-15 25X1A6a proposed by the AD/00 to take over the [REDACTED] office, - it's a mere rubber-stamping process on the part of this Board to say that is the man they want because the only one that knows him is OO, because nobody else has seen the fellow before and has no basis to judge him. I think that is

SECRET

probably true all through the DD/P complex.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] Kirk, you're saying that this was designed to smoke out whether we should have a CIA Career Service system or a series of Office career services, and I admit that when the question is put that way it becomes about as tough a nut as you can find. It's just like trying to hit it with a small hammer and it slides out from the side all the time. If you put the question in exactly that framework one would have to say, then, these careers are in the individual offices, taken in the main. But as we were talking last time, it may be possible, over a period of time, to work this around if we start with the junior people, but certainly at the 14, 15, 16 and 17 level today I don't think there is any doubt that most individuals feel themselves as careerists at the work they are doing at the present time. They got in there by some device and if they weren't satisfied they would be yelling and squeaking so loudly that they would be someplace else.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't know that it is objectionable to have a series of careers within CIA. The Army has arms and services and they have careers within each of those services, in the Infantry, Armored Forces, Engineers, and so on, and from time to time individuals want to transfer from one branch to another. Other line officers might, at a particular time, decide they want to go into the Quartermaster Corps, and those are handled on an individual basis. But the general officers--perhaps the super-grades--are selected by a top board, and regardless of his branch if he is qualified for a high command or staff he is no longer in his branch for career purposes, and I don't see that it is objectionable to do that in CIA.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I certainly think it starts in the offices. For  
25X1A9a example, you have [REDACTED] now--you have them spread  
all over--but I think it was because it worked in the office first.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] The question as I see it is not whether we should have a certain amount of compartmentation of career service boards but how much we should have, and then to what extent and in what manner do we go about providing a necessarily limited but certainly necessary degree of cross-fertilization among the career services that you do have. Now, God knows it seems to me that 26, or however many we have now, is too many. Possibly five may be too few, but I think you ought to work down toward the lowest number that you can possibly work with, in order to cut down the unnecessary

SECRET

fragmentation of this organization which, after all, isn't so big. It certainly isn't as big as the Army.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] It's more highly compartmented than the Army.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: From the intelligence point of view the compartmentation is highly desired and should be maintained. The trend in recent years toward breaking down compartmentation has been detrimental to security and pursued some of our objectives.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] The question of promotion really comes to the fore in this because it is identified with career service to an extent depending upon what point of view you take, but nevertheless to some extent. In the DD/P part of CIA we have this sort of problem: Who is it that is in a position to sit on a promotion board? Let's call it that for a moment so that we don't get misnomers here. Who is it that is qualified to sit on a promotion board and pass on individuals with a PP designation at the present time? Well, the only people that we can find who can make a rational judgment on this are also PP people who happen to know these individuals and have some idea of their day-to-day record. Even in that kind of a situation you find that they are dealing with the promotions of individuals in certain field stations where no individual presently sitting on that board happens to know this guy personally because he has been in the field too long or people have changed, or something of that kind, so that makes it doubly difficult. So the problem that we have of attempting to put the promotion business even farther removed from the actual man, becomes more and more ineffective as we do that, as I see it, 25X1A6a because in attempting to judge whether a Station Chief in [REDACTED] has done a good job and is worthy of promotion or not, depends upon a whole series of factors which don't come to light in a PER, say, because who makes out the PER? Somebody back in headquarters who follows his work. Yet there is an obvious gap there, because how in hell does he know every darn thing the man has done? So combined with what actually shows in the record there has to be some judgment about the value of the individual to this organization, which is hard to assess in some cases. It's relatively easy for a man to take a field station far enough off the beaten track so the brass doesn't visit him periodically, and Lord knows we have a lot of tripping, but it sort of follows a pattern,-- and he can fill the record with some of the best memoranda you have ever seen and never get off his duff. You can fight a paper battle with Washington on

SECRET

some of these things and make it really look remarkable. So there has to be some judgment about whether he has it, in addition to his paper record. So I can't see, at this stage in the development of the Agency--maybe it will come--that we have anything to gain by having promotions considered by intra-Agency boards, except possibly at the very highest level where you come to a question of having two GS-18 vacancies and six candidates and how you are going to decide which candidates get them, and even at that it would be difficult at best.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think what is more necessary is the uniform requirements or standards for eligibility for consideration for promotion. There is not much of it, but I have had a few cases--probably half a dozen--where another Area Division will tell one of my people: "You're a 9 over there but if you come over to us we will make you an 11 right off the bat." Apparently the standards for promotion are not uniform. I think if they were it would be useful.

MR. BAIRD: Well, there are standards on paper. As I understand the charter of the Personnel Office that is to work one way. In other words, if an office or division recommends a promotion from a 14 to a 15 you recommend to the Assistant Director for Personnel and he makes the promotion. He may question whether the man meets the standards of a GS-15 job. If Harry Reynolds sets up a procedure where, in effect, he has a board that advises him on it, you do keep the man from being promoted into a 15 job who doesn't deserve to be promoted. But what Harry is not set up to do yet is to say there are some offices promoting from 14 to 15 that aren't. But you do have a board procedure for passing on promotions which is, in effect, an Agency Board in the Personnel Office.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED]: You don't have a minimum time-in-grade across the board.

25X1A9a

MR. BAIRD: Well that, I don't think, needs a panel to determine.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] But there should be a general Agency policy.

[REDACTED] You don't need a board to do that.

MR. BAIRD: You need an Agency policy, which we have been trying to work out for two to three years.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me summarize the views then, as I understand them, on promotion policy. It seems to be the general consensus of the Board

SECRET

that intra-Agency boards are feasible on only the highest level, and that all other promotions should be left to the individual offices with the understanding that on the over-all career service basis we have a compartmentation which should be preserved for the good of the Agency, with the exception of those individuals who have demonstrated ability to become CIA executive material.

To carry it further, wouldn't it be a logical corollary to say that when an individual goes into the Executive Inventory he sheds, like a snake-skin, his prior career designation and becomes straight E? He is not FI, he is not PM and he is not OTR, but he is a CIA Executive because he has moved up into that category.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Does that mean you can't promote a man from a 14 to a 15 without permission of the Board, and does it mean that the person can elect to go into a 15 spot that you have vacant or go into some other job outside of the office?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I think if a man is going to be promoted into that category he certainly should have the facts, and the promotion presented to him with the indication that he may be moving into a grade where his chances for shifting into another part of the Agency are diminished.

MR. BAIRD: Couldn't we defer action on the last part of your recommendation until we see how this Executive Inventory works? I haven't seen any evidence of it working yet, but I would like to see whether it is working and how these situations may fit or not fit.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would be against that, Matt, from the point of view you aren't going to see how your Executive Inventory works until a period of years have passed.

MR. BAIRD: What I meant was, maybe we are not ready yet for the last part of your recommendation.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That could be true but I don't think that is important. I do think it seems to be a fairly obvious corollary that when you get up into that general category you lose your nationality.

MR. BAIRD: Well, let's just take Joe - he's talked here about his Division. If he is in danger of losing a potential Chief of Contacts [REDACTED] because he is on the Executive Inventory he may not put his name in for the Executive Inventory, and if we are going to have an Executive Inventory we don't want that to happen.

25X1A8b

SECRET

SECRET

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think in that case, Matt, the individual, as I said, ought to be given the right to determine himself whether he wants to be promoted into that job with the restrictions that may carry with it or go before a board for some other possible job in the Agency. It shouldn't prohibit us from promoting him into that job and shouldn't force us to bring him before the Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Actually I think we are quibbling over a fairly minor detail because I don't think this is going to be a matter of major policy but is actually one of the practical implementations.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] do you want to go on with your comments? I am sure we are going to have some more to say about promotion.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Paragraph 3c. (Reading)

With the exception of one or two offices there is little career planning by the Boards, yet this is one of the most important aspects of career service and one of the most neglected parts of career development.

I can't speak for the other boards, but my Board is earnestly endeavoring to plan a career for a man as far in advance as we can see, both his training and his rotation into other jobs to broaden him. I couldn't say that we lay out a 10-year or a 20-year program for a man but we certainly lay out a general, tentative program. We don't earmark him for certain jobs for years but we start with the very lowest ones and have in mind and document it, the immediate career. We took an engineer who had considerable experience in OSS and made him Chief of the Southeast Asia area. When he comes back it is very likely that he will go into the Plans and Policy Staff, according to his desires at that time, and he may go on back into engineering or he may go into command of another area. We can't plan careers for radio operators who are on the first tour with us until we find out how they are going to work out. But we find some of them who are outstanding in the field. Even at a one-man station where it is indicated that he is officer material we mark that on his record and when he comes up again for assignment he is then put into a job in one of the overseas areas where he can broaden himself just as fast as he can go. To that extent we are planning their careers. But it is a very difficult thing to do when you have two categories. You have the enlisted type who may elect to stay with you one enlistment, two years or three years, and then leave. But after they have had about their second enlistment

SECRET

then they are getting up into the junior officer grade, if you compare it to the military, and according to the qualifications that he develops and his competency is demonstrated, then he is definitely earmarked for a career as a communications operations officer or a communications security officer. But always, at some time in his career, he is going to change over from one of those. [REDACTED], who is a professional in training, is now going to the security field, so he is marked for a career in either of those two. I think it is easier to do it in my office than in any other offices because we are running a communications office or system. I can't comment on what the other boards do.

MR. [REDACTED]: In other words, might this not mean, at least in the communications area, the planning for careers can become effective at the time an individual has demonstrated his career potential, which is approximately at the end of three years, which is the point at which the Board decreed the career service will really become effective? When he has entered into the career service then true planning can become effective.

[REDACTED] Yes, that is right. It is very difficult to do with the clerical people. They reach the top of a 7 and a few of them a 9, but they can't change over into communications and the best we can do is to see if we can't get them into some other office where--for their education--they could do writing or do research. Of course, that is where we have the highest turn-over rate, with the clerical people.

Paragraph 3d. - I don't know that I understand that exactly. (Reading)

The career service boards have served to dissipate both the authority of the supervisors and of the Personnel Management.

In my Career Service Board I don't know that we are usurping any of the prerogatives of the Assistant Director of Personnel. I agree that that Office ought to be held responsible for policy and the supervisors for implementation, but a supervisor in that sense is the head of the office and is advised by the Career Service Board to implement the policies approved by the Assistant Director of Personnel. I don't think my Career Service Board is doing anything contrary to the Assistant Director of Personnel's policy, but if the policy doesn't exist then we apply a policy, such as time in grade for consideration for promotion. I can't comment on the other boards. My Board is not a paper mill. It takes a certain amount of paper to build up a dossier



SECRET

25X1A9a  
on the individual, and in planning his career we have it down to a form now that is fairly simple. I think you have observed it. (Indicating Mr. [REDACTED])

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we have accomplished some elimination of paper mills in recent months. We have stopped the necessity of each office reporting to the Director of Training on their training, and Rud has cancelled the Career Service Board manuals, which were great accumulations of paper. I think the less reporting that is required out of the immediate office, the better, the point being that I think any organization, committee or board has a tendency to be self-generating in the creation of memoranda, paper directives, and so on.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] It is true my Career Service Board is doing personnel management that my Personnel Office would do if they were qualified to do it, but they can't be qualified to do it. The Career Service Board has members who know these individuals or bring before the Board the individual's supervisor who knows the man under consideration for assignment or promotion. The only way the Personnel Office could handle these things would be as the military does with an MOS and rank, and you consider him entirely mechanically. So the Career Service Board is right in the midst of personnel management.

Paragraph 4a. - I have no comment because it doesn't affect me.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] May I ask one question there? Is that the old alignment of the five major components or are you breaking it down completely?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Actually what I would like to see done is to get away from components and set it up on a functional, professional basis.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] In other words, our administrative personnel come under the DD/A Board?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, I think we agreed earlier today that was not to be a coercive process but an educational process. So I guess all of our administrative personnel would call themselves "Intelligence". As I reminded Colonel Baird last week, this is not to be used for lobbying or advertising purposes.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I wouldn't want the responsibility for his communicators because I wouldn't know them and I wouldn't be able to handle them properly. I think there might be some rotation between us, though.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Kirk, did you have in mind that all DD/I personnel

SECRET

and all FI personnel would come under this "Intelligence" heading?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Under "Operations." I was using "Intelligence" in the case of the researcher, the analyst and the processor, not the operator who was processing it.

MR. [REDACTED] Would the Contact Division, then, come under Operations?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Technically speaking they should, but then perhaps we are attacking an organizational rather than a career problem.

[REDACTED] The part of paragraph 4c. I like is that these boards would be supported by staffs supplied jointly by the Personnel Office and the Office primarily concerned. I'd like very much to have a permanent Secretary and Recorder for my Board supplied by the Personnel Office.

Paragraph 4d. - I have already indicated that I would concur in a Super-grade Panel as presently composed. I wouldn't buy the Senior Selection Panel or the Junior Selection Panel for reasons I think we have already discussed. That would be a fine thing if we could do it, to have each employee-applicant personally interviewed by a Board, but they come from all over the country and I don't think you could get them in to have them interviewed because of the expense of it, but if you wanted it I think it would be fine. I can tell if they are technically qualified but I would like to have some of the people like the Assessment and Evaluation folks, and the Medical, to examine them before we say we want them. Then they have to go through the security check and go back home and wait, and if they break down on security then we have wasted that money on them. I think it is an ideal, but I don't think it is entirely workable. I think it should be applied to people who can come to Washington. The recruiters have vastly improved. The field interviews now really try to tell you what they think the boy's background is, together with his PHS, and you can see what his family life is, which is a great help. But actually, for a group of experienced people to see that individual and talk to him and smoke him out on his motivation, we would probably have fewer busts in the field than we do now.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It would be entirely dependent upon the rate of influx into the Agency. At the old rate of 100 a month it would be completely impractical, but if we got down to a very limited attrition and flow into the Agency, then I think it would be desirable, and I think it would save money in the end, even though there would be that expense for a day or two in Washington.

SECRET

If we could eliminate some people before the end of that first year I think the end savings would be worth it.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] We will always have 100 a month to keep up with our attrition. That is only 10 per cent a year, which is very low.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] What do you think the cost is to bring someone on duty, before they are useful? About \$1000?

MR. WHITE: I don't know about training or clearing them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: For recruiting, clearing and entrance on duty.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I thought it was something around \$1000.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think the best I heard on security was about \$400 a case.

MR. WHITE: It's much less. I think it's closer to \$200.

MR. REYNOLDS: \$200.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I remember we used to pay the FBI \$100 a case.

MR. WHITE: I think the last report I had our security cost was a few dollars less than we used to pay the FBI. I think it's around \$200, but I'm not sure. Frankly, I've never studied the cost of recruiting and training.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] There are hidden overhead costs.

MR. [REDACTED] It's hard to prorate.

MR. [REDACTED] We don't have a cost accounting system to permit us to do that.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] For the last five months I think I have lost 13 people a month. I asked my Personnel people what it took to replace those, just to meet that attrition, and I was told it took about 500 field interviews to get about 50 people to get that 13 aboard. They lose out on security or they get disgusted because it takes so long, and they quit even after they get in a pool. Then we get them down to the training school and they fail academically or we find out things about them so that we have to eliminate them on a security basis. It seems to me it would be worth a study to see if we could at least approach it.

MR. WHITE: Isn't it also true we aren't taking on anybody but the technicians? We are just talking about those few people that we hire and commit ourselves to without a personal interview, and that doesn't get very far up the ladder, actually.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] There must be a tremendous amount of interviewing. I

SECRET

SECRET

would agree that it takes 500 to produce 50.

MR. REYNOLDS: That is absolutely true.

MR. WHITE: But you don't eliminate that, in any case.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] The 500 aren't interviewed in Washington but the 50 are, for all practical purposes. Isn't that about the size of it? Not necessarily, but on an average?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Almost none of mine are interviewed in Washington.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] That, of course, isn't true in the officer category in the DD/P.

MR. WHITE: I just don't think we have, around the table here, the information we need to tackle this one.

MR. REYNOLDS: It can be easily obtained. We have it all tabulated.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it would be very interesting, Harry, to find out what we could actually save by bringing certain people in for a Panel Interview for certain types of jobs.

MR. REYNOLDS: When an interviewer goes to the Katherine Gibbs School in Providence, Rhode Island, he gets say, three who say they are interested, and he might over three weeks get one of those three, so he has talked to nine to get one. They are figures very similar to that. It's about 10 per cent of the people interviewed on the clerical.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Paragraph 4e. - I'm going to skip the rest of that because it appears to be controversial.

The standard probationary period established at three years? Yes, I agree with that.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] Could you make that stick?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think we can administratively, because the thing that is most important in that is, I think, that you don't change your commitments to your present employees, and that has to be made very clear to those that have been brought in up to the day this is implemented and announced that henceforth all individuals are entering on a three-year probationary period. I think from an administrative point of view the one year elimination is something that can be accomplished by a stroke of the pen. The three-year elimination will require Employment Review Board proceedings. But it will do one thing-- and this is the most important thing it can do in the Agency today--it will get the supervisors sharpened up to the fact that they have a certain amount of

~~SECRET~~

CONFIDENTIAL

time to judge their people and size them up. If we can do that we will save this Agency some money.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] The Board has already approved a large part of paragraph 4, - the Selection Board and the three-year probationary period, that has all been approved about five times around the Board here, so it's no longer controversial.

25X1A9a

MR. [REDACTED] I just didn't know, Rud, I didn't know whether you could select somebody out at the end of three years, which is way beyond Civil Service.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: Paragraph 4g. - I concur with the first sentence and have no comments on the second sentence.

Paragraph 5 - I don't think "a" is workable. (Reading)

Prior to employment the individual's career plan would be reviewed by the appropriate selection panel, and the individual would appear before the panel.

Again, there is that security-lag time in there. We do take people on in the uncleared pool. Again there is the travel. Now this would mean two trips to Washington, although maybe they could be combined into one.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: They could be combined, I think. What I have in mind here actually, and once again, you would perhaps have to take a level you were working on, but say everybody from a GS-12 and above, prior to recruiting the individual you have to have a job which you want him to perform, so you look at that individual and decide whether perhaps it is a simple thing if you want to hold him for the rest of his life.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That is workable. I have taken nobody on at a grade above a nine without an interview and discussion in Washington or in the field. I have one case of a Navy Commander who has been closely associated with my headquarters' staff out in the field, and we put the problem up to him-- he's a reserve officer--and we will take him on without my seeing him, but he is well-known in the communications fraternity. But I wouldn't take a twelve on without a personal interview not only by myself but by several of the engineers, and discuss what his career would be. I don't want to take him unless he is going to stay with us, but I don't think you can do it with the great mass of people, say all the radio operators and cryptographers who come in, who don't know anything about the Agency and don't know whether they want

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

to stay with it.

I have my doubts about paragraph 5b. (Reading)

At the end of one year and again at the end of three years the appropriate selection panel would review the individual's performance and indicate continuance or termination.

That is what my Career Service Board does now, in general, not at the end of a year because at the end of a year he has probably been overseas only three or four months, but his supervisor in the field puts in the equivalent of efficiency reports whenever he thinks it necessary, in addition to the regular Personnel Evaluation Report he puts in, and then six months before he is due to come back home he fills out a home leave and reassignment request in which he states his duties, what they have been, and his preference for his future, whether in another area or more training. Then his immediate supervisor or the Area Chief comment on his performance of duty and recommend whether or not he is with us for the long haul, and that is all considered by the Career Service Board.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Maybe your Career Service Board isn't doing it exactly in the pattern outlined here but it sounds almost exactly like the pattern generally proposed here, on a communications basis.

MR. BAIRD: We have already agreed on this.

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] We have. It is in the paper which is going to the Director.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] And paragraph 5c. is exactly what we are doing now. (Reading)

At the end of the three year probationary period the appropriate career service board will review the individual's career plan for the ensuing period.

That isn't something you can hand to the guy and say this is your ticket for the next ten years. It's as far as we can go with him. It's not as formal as that but is as far as we can go with him.

We have already discussed paragraph 5d., and I don't think I have anything to add.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, in view of the fact that our time is up, would the Board like to discuss this paper one more meeting?

25X1A9a MR. [REDACTED] I think so, yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And then decide what action should be taken toward

~~SECRET~~ ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~  
CONFIDENTIAL

what we want to do about the Career Service Program. And I would like to put before you as a goal that we try and get what we think ought to be running into operation as of 1 July, and see that a fairly clear and concise statement is then issued to all people so that they know what the Career Service Program is about and what they can expect.

Now, as instructed by the Board, when I addressed the Orientation Course last Friday--as Messrs. Baird and Reynolds can attest to--I laid to rest, I hope, at least with 600 people, the fact that rotation was for the masses. I think I used the figure of five per cent, at most. Well, the record will show what figure I used. But I made it very clear that rotation was for highly selected individuals.

One thing which I would like to do--and I think it probably provides a pretty good opportunity for Harry Reynolds, if he is willing to go along--is to go to all the meetings of the individual CIA Career Service Boards and see if I can answer any questions that come up, and Harry can answer the questions on the Personnel Office side. I will be happy to attend them, Rud. And, Rud, will you undertake to arrange that and go along as our escort?

Then, to follow through on the decision we made last week on the 120 slots, Harry, I have some ideas and I think maybe you and Matt and I ought to discuss them at an early date.

MR. REYNOLDS: As soon as I get a first draft I will get hold of you and Matt and go over it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Any new business?

We stand adjourned. Thank you, gentlemen.

. . . The Meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m. . . .